

TO: The Honorable District Judge Anna. J. Brown  
United States District Court for the District of Oregon

From: Gary Gosha and Kit Gosha, Plaintiffs pro se, 503-522-6571

Case: 3:16-CV-0073-BR

Date: August 30, 2016

Subject: Request to Supplement Plaintiffs Response (Docket 106) to BANA's Request for Judicial Notice (Docket 96)

CC: Danielle Crockford and James Laurick (BANA), Peter Salmon (BONYM)

Plaintiffs would like to inform the Court that on August 23, 2016 (early last week), Defendant Bank of America (BANA) produced supplemental documents to the Plaintiffs in response to their May 23<sup>rd</sup> RFP.

Included in these documents is new evidence that the Plaintiffs believe is both material and relevant to BANA's Reply (Docket 95), its supporting Request for Judicial Notice (Docket 96 and 97), and Plaintiffs Response (Docket 106). Had the Plaintiffs been aware of these documents at the time they filed their Response, they would have included them as exhibits.

Plaintiffs are unsure how to present this evidence to the Court. It seems that a Supplemental Response related to Docket 106 would be in order but a letter to the Court might suffice as well. Does the Court have a preference, or another recommendation?

Plaintiffs certify that they have conferred by email on the subject of the new documents with BANA's attorney Danielle Crockford but have not reached an agreement that would negate the need to present this evidence to the Court prior to its ruling on the Motions to Dismiss pleadings.

Respectfully,

  
Gary Gosha